IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

GEORGE MAURICE T. ADAMS,)	CIVIL ACTION No. 3:11-cv-31-DCN
)	
Petitioner,	
)	
vs.	
)	<u>ORDER</u>
ANTHONY J. PADULA, Warden, ALAN)	
WILSON, South Carolina Attorney General,)	
)	
Respondents.	
)	

Petitioner George Maurice T. Adams ("Adams") has filed a Motion Requesting a Certificate of Appealability pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

A certificate of appealability may issue "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). To meet this burden an applicant must show that "reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were 'adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (citing *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 (1983)).¹

Here, this court previously concluded that Adams' claims are without merit. Adams has raised no new arguments which cause the court to view the issues as debatable, conclude that the issues could have been resolved differently, or find that the issues raise questions which warrant further review. Indeed, this court denied a certificate of appealability in its order dated March

¹When the denial of relief is based upon procedural grounds, a certificate of appealability should issue if "jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling." *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 485.

5, 2012. Therefore, Adams' motion is improperly filed in this court.

It is therefore **ORDERED**, for the foregoing reasons, that Adams' Motion Requesting Certificate of Appealability is hereby **DENIED**.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

DAVID C. NORTON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

February 13, 2013 Charleston, South Carolina